

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-16, which are pending in the above-identified patent application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 15, the specification, and the drawing. No new matter has been added by way of the amendments herein.

Interview

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesies that he extended during the telephone interview conducted on March 31, 2011.

During the interview, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed the inferentially claimed element of “a cable drum for a power or manual window lift drive” –and the potential for positively reciting the cable drum, the relationship of the power drive to the larger diameter area, and the relationship of the manual drive to the narrower diameter area. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment would very likely move the case forward, implying (but not guaranteeing) that such an amendment would overcome U.S. 6,758,012. The Examiner said that he would search the applicable art again in light of any amendment (most likely U.S. Classifications 49/139 and 49/140).

The overall tone of the interview was very positive regarding the likelihood of an allowance.

Objection to the Drawings

At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to indicate where the cross-sectional views of FIGS. 1 and 2 are taken. In response, Applicant has amended FIG. 4 and has requested that the Examiner accept the proposed amended FIG. 4, attached hereto and labeled REPLACEMENT SHEET. The amendment to FIG. 4 consists of adding a cross-section reference line and labels "1/2 --- 1/2" to indicate the location of the cross-sectional views.

Applicant has amended the specification in order to be consistent with the amendment to FIG. 4.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

At pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,758,012. In view of the amendments herein and remarks below, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as amended now require both a cable drum for a window lift drive (either manual or power) and a mounting area that is structurally designed to accommodate either of the cable drums. In order to achieve such capability, the subject claims require that the first and second areas of the mounting are have respective, differing diameters for accommodating the power and manual window lift drives.

The above structural features may be more readily appreciated when considering an embodiment of the claimed subject matter shown in FIGS. 1 and 2 of the instant application. The door module 100 (or carrier) includes an integrally formed drum housing 104 having side walls and a back wall that are integrally formed as a single piece, which define an inner volume. The inner volume includes first and second areas, each having a particular diameter 107, 112 suitable for receiving either a cable drum 108 for a power window lift drive or cable drum 118 for a manual window lift drive. A thrust bearing 120 (or slide bearing) is integrally formed on the back wall of the drum housing 104 and is sized, shaped, and in axial alignment with the first and second areas so that it receives a mounting axle 122 of the manual window lift drive.

As discussed during the interview, U.S. 6,758,012 fails to disclose or suggest the above structural details of claims 1, 8, and 15 – particularly that the apparatus includes a cable drum for either a manual or power window lift drive. Although U.S. 6,758,012 appears to disclose a housing system, such system is structurally configured to achieve a door locking function. Consequently, there is no disclosure of the window lift features as claimed – and further there is no disclosure of the claimed requirement for the first and second areas having respective, differing diameters for accommodating the power and manual window lift drives.

According, Applicant respectfully requests that the anticipation rejection of the subject claims be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

At pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 13, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. 6,758,012. In view of the amendments herein and remarks below, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection.

The deficiencies of U.S. 6,758,012 as concerns claims 1, 8, and 15 of the instant application, as discussed above, are not overcome under an obviousness analysis. Indeed U.S. 6,758,012 fails to disclose any structure meeting the limitations concerning the cable drum for the manual or power lift drive and/or the relationships of such cable drums to the diameters of the housing.

According, Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness rejection of the subject claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the instant claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited. In the event there are any fees due and owing (or refundable) in connection with this matter, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Dated: April 8, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By: s/Matthew B. Dernier
Matthew B. Dernier
Registration No.: 40,989
GIBSON & DERNIER LLP
900 Route 9 North, Suite 504
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095
Telephone (732) 634-7634
Attorneys for Applicant